



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,830	10/15/2001	Hiroshi Kaneda	7217/65714	4536

7590 04/13/2004

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

KOSTAK, VICTOR R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/977,830

**Applicant(s)**

KANEDA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Victor R. Kostak

**Art Unit**

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-20, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2614

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Note MPEP 606.01.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ludtke et al.

The tiled display system of Ludtke (noting particularly Figs. 2, 3 and 9) includes a composite screen comprised of plural display units (even-numbered) 24-40 by which master device 22 presents a post-video processed signal originating from any suitable video source 20 (col. 8 lines 35-39). Prior to display of the post-processed video signal, Ludtke prepares the composite screen arrangement by displaying what can be considered a schematic display of the video signal (prior to its post processing state) on the display units (of the composite screen) as a display area based on the positions of the respective units and the state of display data regarding the initial video signal (e.g. col. 9 line 57 – col. 10 line 18). The state of the display reads on the latency value of each unit (col. 10 line 65 – col. 11 line 24), or even just the condition of each unit being on or off. Upon completion of the preparation done by controller (CPU 70), the controller then instructs the composite screen to display the processed readied video signal (i.e. the claimed post-video processed signal) so tailored (i.e. latency, scale, etc.) on the respective

Art Unit: 2614

component units based on the determined adjustments and X/Y position data required for knowing which unit is to display which image portion (e.g. Fig. 2; col. 11 lines 45-50), thereby meeting claims 1, 12 and 23.

As for claims 2 and 13, the CPU controls the display position of the ultimate composite image by controlling the individual positions of the respective component images, again, by determining the X/Y positions during the preparation processing.

As for claims 5 and 16, the size of the displayed image is also determined during the preparation stage, wherein scaling is performed (e.g. col. 3 lines 56-60; col. 13 lines 2-13).

Regarding claims 8 and 19, the preliminary image in the preparation stage can be a designated a pseudo image presented temporarily (i.e. spuriously) that reflects (indicates) the result of the preparation control process.

As for claims 9 and 20, properties of the displayed pseudo image include brightness and component image sizes, as well as color (all of which are typical inherent features of an image), made possible by the display 24 controlled by CPU 70.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke et al.

Art Unit: 2614

As for claims 3 and 14, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a guide of some sort to provide the user with an indication of which display unit is being processed (or at least identified) at any one time. Such is suggested by Ludtke by the fact that graphic images can be displayed (e.g. col. 7 line 41) and that keyboard 88 and mouse 90 interfaces can be used. Ludtke also points out that the master device first determines the configuration of the display units including how many units should be used (col. 7 lines 50), thereby further suggesting that a guide, such as a pointer, cursor, or highlight (typically associated with graphics and keyboard/mouse interfaces) would have been obvious to use in identifying the individual units and display areas of the units, in the preparation stage or even after to displaying the post-processed image for subsequent adjustments.

Considering claims 4 and 15, it would have been obvious (if not necessary) to determine the degree of movement in the X and Y directions per unit in order to assist in positioning the component images, in turn to arrange the composite image over the ideal display location, which would be done in the preparation stage.

As for claims 6 and 17, it would have been obvious to use a guide, such as a pointer, cursor or highlight, as mentioned above, for determining the preferred image size, since a guide is generally very useful for identifying and subsequently processing data in individual screen units.

Regarding claims 7 and 18, although Ludtke does not describe or specify plural input units, a second one used for applying the size dimensions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to consider different keys or keying sequences (used for size determination) as separate components of the composite keyboard/mouse interface devices.

Art Unit: 2614

Alternatively, separate dedicated inputs for size control would have been obvious to use as so preferred by the designer for the benefit of accommodating the operator with separately identifiable inputs.

4. Claims 11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke et al. in view of Smith.

It would have been obvious to present any type of image data on the composite display device so preferred and as so available since the type of data does not dictate the arrangement of the overall system. Since program (schedule) guides are very well known and can be displayed on a large screen device, as taught by Smith (col. 10 line 42; col. 5 lines 14-16), it would have been obvious to display such on a tiled large screen display, even suggested by Ludtke alone since he mentions that the video source can be a set-top box (col. 8 lines 35-39) which typically has guides associated therewith.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Claims 10 and 21 appear allowable over the prior art.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor R. Kostak whose telephone number is 703 305-4374. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30am-3:00pm.

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 703 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**Or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 308-HELP.



Victor R. Kostak  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2614

Application/Control Number: 09/977,830

Page 7

Art Unit: 2614

VRK